

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,099	03/22/2007	Reiner Fischer	2400.0400000/SRL	6737
26111 7590 11/14/2008 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			RODRIGUEZ-GARCIA, VALERIE	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/579.099 FISCHER ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit VALERIE RODRIGUEZ-GARCIA 1626 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2007. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-6.8.9.11-15 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-6,8,9,11-15 and 17-19 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S6/06) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _ 6) Other:

VRG

Application/Control Number: 10/579,099 Page 2

Art Unit: 1626

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is a 371 of PCT/EP04/12646 filed on 11/09/2004.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-15 and 17-19 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, Claims 1-5 and 8 drawn to products of Formula I of claim 1. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required. Further restriction based on the election may be made.

Group II, Claim 6, drawn to a process for preparing compounds of Formula I of Group I. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required. Further restriction based on the election may be made.

Group III, Claim 9, drawn to a method of controlling pests or unwanted vegetation. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required.

Group IV, Claim 11, drawn to a process for preparing pesticides or herbicides with compounds of Formula I. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required.

Art Unit: 1626

Group V, Claims 12-14, drawn to compositions comprising a combination of active compounds. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required. Further restriction based on the election may be made.

Group VI, Claim 15, drawn to a method for controlling unwanted vegetation with compounds of claim 12 (Group V). If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required.

Group VII, Claims 17-18, drawn to a product of the formula (II) or (XVI). If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required. Further restriction based on the election may be made.

Group VIII, Claim 19, drawn to a process for preparing a compound. If this group is elected, a further election of a single disclosed species is also required.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under 35 USC 121 or PCT Rule 13.1 because they lack the same or corresponding special technical features:

The special technical feature of Group I is the the spirocyclic pyrrolidin ketoenol core having 2-ethyl-4,6-dimethylphenyl. Such spyrocyclic pyrrolidin ketoenol core is not considered to contribute an inventive step or concept over the prior art in view that the core is not novel (see WO01/74770A1, supplied in the IDS of 02-22-07 and cited in the international search report). As such, Group I does not share a special technical feature with Groups II-VIII. Therefore, the claims are not so linked by a special technical

feature within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2 so as to form a single inventive concept, and unity between Groups I-VII and between Markush species is broken.

Election of Species

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- Drawing of the chemical structure (no variables) of a compound of Formula I (claims1-6, 8-9,11)
- Drawing of the chemical structure of the reagents (no variables) used for preparation of the compound of Formula I (claim 6)
- Drawing of the chemical structure (no variables) of the exact combination of compounds in the composition (claims 12-15)
- . Drawing of the chemical structure and reagents (no variables) of a compound of Formula II or XVI (claims17-18)

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1626

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

a)Each chemical species is a distinct chemical lacking a special technical feature in view of the fact that the core of the chemical is not novel and has been previously disclosed in the prior art (WO01/74770A1).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn and the rejoined process

Art Unit: 1626

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be **allowable**, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai; In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C.§ 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include all the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Filing of appropriate terminal disclaimer in anticipation of a rejoinder may speed prosecution and the process of rejoinder.

 Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Art Unit: 1626

3. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VALERIE RODRIGUEZ-GARCIA whose telephone number is (571)270-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 1626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

VRG /Kamal A Saeed/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626